arXiv:1402.4003v1 [math.NA] 17 Feb 2014

COMPUTATION OF A FUNCTION OF A MATRIX WITH CLOSE EIGENVALUES BY MEANS OF THE NEWTON INTERPOLATING POLYNOMIAL

V.G. KURBATOV AND I.V. KURBATOVA

Abstract. An algorithm for computing an analytic function of a matrix A is described. The algorithm is intended for the case where A has some close eigenvalues, and clusters (subsets) of close eigenvalues are separated from each other. This algorithm is a modification of some well known and widely used algorithms. A novel feature is an approximate calculation of divided differences for the Newton interpolating polynomial in a special way. This modification does not require to reorder the Schur triangular form and to solve Sylvester equations.

1. Introduction

Matrix functions (see, e.g., [5, 7]) play a role of a useful language and an effective tool in many applications. The most popular matrix function is the matrix exponential; it is closely connected with solutions of differential equations. One of the problems (see [12, 13]) that arise in the process of calculating a function f of a matrix A is appearing of expressions of the form $\frac{f(\mu_1)-f(\mu_2)}{\mu_1-\mu_2}$, where μ_1 and μ_2 are eigenvalues of the matrix A. If the eigenvalues μ_1 and μ_2 are close to each other, the literal meaning of the expression $\frac{f(\mu_1)-f(\mu_2)}{\mu_1-\mu_2}$ implies the calculation of differences of close numbers, which leads to essential loss of accuracy, see [12, 13] for a detailed discussion. If the difference $\mu_1-\mu_2$ is very small, it is reasonable to change approximately the expression $\frac{f(\mu_1)-f(\mu_2)}{\mu_1-\mu_2}$ by $f'(\mu_1)$. But if the difference $\mu_1-\mu_2$ is neither large nor small, then the problem becomes more serious.

A way of overcoming this problem was discussed in [14, 15, 10, 11, 16, 3, 9]. The initial step consists in the transformation of the matrix A to a triangular form by means of the Schur algorithm (see, e.g., [7, ch. 7]). As a result, in particular, the spectrum of the matrix A becomes known. After that the spectrum is divided into clusters (parts) S_j in such a way that the eigenvalues within a cluster are close to each other, and the eigenvalues from different clusters lie far apart, for a detailed discussion of this procedure we refer to [11, 3]. Then, the Schur triangular representation *is reordered*, i.e., it is changed so that the eigenvalues (which are the diagonal elements of the triangular matrix) from the same cluster are situated near to each other (the standard Schur algorithm does not guarantee such an ordering even in the case of the real spectrum). Thus, one arrives at the block triangular

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65F60, 41A10, 65D05.

Key words and phrases. Matrix function, matrix exponential, Schur decomposition, Newton interpolating polynomial, impulse response.

The second author was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, research project No. 13-01-00378.

representation in which the spectra of different diagonal blocks are concentrated in small sets (clusters), and, at the same time, are widely spaced from each other. Finally, the function of the block triangular matrix is calculated recursively, i.e., one block diagonal after the other, see [14, 15]; these computations employ solving the Sylvester equations. When the function f is applied to an individual diagonal block, the function f is replaced by its Taylor expansion, see [10, 3]. As a consequence the problem connected with the calculation of divided differences of the kind $\frac{f(\mu_1)-f(\mu_2)}{\mu_1-\mu_2}$ with close μ_1 and μ_2 disappears.

In this article a modification of the above algorithm is offered. It allows one to avoid the procedures of reordering the triangular Schur representation and solving the Sylvester equations.

The idea of the algorithm consists in the calculation of the approximate Newton interpolating polynomial $p(A)$ of A instead of $f(A)$, where the points of interpolation are eigenvalues μ_i of A. In this case the problem of cancellation of close numbers in the divided differences $\frac{f(\mu_1)-f(\mu_2)}{\mu_1-\mu_2}$ moves to the stage of forming the Newton interpolating polynomial p. The problem is solved in the old way, i.e., by means of an approximation of f by its Taylor polynomial in a neighbourhood of close eigenvalues, which leads to a calculation of p with high accuracy. So, it remains to substitute the matrix A into p. Numerical experiments show that the algorithm can be used when the order n of the matrix A is less then 30. The algorithm implies that the calculation of a matrix polynomial is a solvable problem. In this connection we refer to [17, 8] where the calculation of matrix powers and matrix polynomials are discussed.

In Section 2 the definition of the Newton interpolating polynomial is recalled. In Section 3 the calculation of divided differences is analysed. The whole algorithm is described in Section 4. Some numerical experiments are presented in Section 5. In Section 6 an application to a symbolic calculation of the impulse response of a dynamical system is discussed.

2. The Newton interpolating polynomial

Let $\mu_1,\ \mu_2,\ \ldots,\ \mu_n$ be given complex numbers (some of them may coincide with others) called *points of interpolation*. Let a complex-valued function f be defined and analytic in a neighbourhood of these points. *Divided differences* of the function f with respect to the points $\mu_1,\ \mu_2,\ \ldots,\ \mu_n$ are defined (see, e.g., [6]) by the recurrent relations

(1)
$$\Delta_i^i f = f^{[0]}(\mu_i) = f(\mu_i),$$
$$\Delta_i^{i+1} f = f^{[1]}(\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}) = \frac{f^{[0]}(\mu_{i+1}) - f^{[0]}(\mu_i)}{\mu_{i+1} - \mu_i},$$
$$\Delta_i^{i+m} f = f^{[m]}(\mu_i, \ldots, \mu_{i+m}) = \frac{f^{[m-1]}(\mu_{i+1}, \ldots, \mu_{i+m}) - f^{[m-1]}(\mu_i, \ldots, \mu_{i+m-1})}{\mu_{i+m} - \mu_i}.$$

In these formulas, if the denominator vanishes, then the quotient means the derivative with respect to one of the arguments of the previous divided difference (this agreement may by derived by continuity from Corollary 2).

Proposition 1. *The divided differences possess the representation*

$$f^{[m]}(\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_{i+m}) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_\Gamma \frac{f(\lambda)\, d\lambda}{(\lambda - \mu_i)(\lambda - \mu_{i+1}) \dots (\lambda - \mu_{i+m})},$$

where the contour Γ *encloses all the points of interpolation* μ_i, μ_{i+1}, …, μ_{i+m}.

Proof. See [6, ch. 1, § 4.3, formula (54)]. □

Corollary 2. *The divided difference* $\Delta_i^{i+m} f = f^{[m]}(\mu_i, \mu_{i+1}, \dots, \mu_{i+m})$ *is a symmetric function, i.e., it does not depend on the order of its arguments* μ_i, μ_{i+1}, …, μ_{i+m}.

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 1. □

It is convenient to arrange the divided differences into the triangular table

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \Delta_1^1 & \Delta_2^2 & \dots & \Delta_k^k & \dots & \Delta_{n-2}^{n-2} & \Delta_{n-1}^{n-1} & \Delta_n^n \\ \Delta_1^2 & \Delta_2^3 & \dots & \Delta_k^{k+1} & \dots & \Delta_{n-2}^{n-1} & \Delta_{n-1}^n & \\ \Delta_1^3 & \Delta_2^4 & \dots & \Delta_k^{k+2} & \dots & \Delta_{n-2}^n & & \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & & \\ \Delta_1^{n-1} & \Delta_2^n & & & & & & \\ \Delta_1^n & & & & & & & \end{array} \tag{2}$$

The interpolating polynomial in the Newton form or shortly *the Newton interpolating polynomial* with respect to the points μ_1, μ_2, …, μ_n is (see, e.g., [6]) the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} p(\lambda) = {} & \Delta_1^1 f + (\lambda - \mu_1)\Delta_1^2 f + (\lambda - \mu_2)(\lambda - \mu_1)\Delta_1^3 f \\ & + (\lambda - \mu_3)(\lambda - \mu_2)(\lambda - \mu_1)\Delta_1^4 f + \dots \\ & + (\lambda - \mu_{n-1})(\lambda - \mu_{n-2}) \dots (\lambda - \mu_1)\Delta_1^n f. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We stress that the Newton interpolating polynomial contains only divided differences from the first column of table (2). The main property of the interpolating polynomial is (see, e.g., [6]) the equalities

$$p(\mu_i) = f(\mu_i), \qquad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

If two or more points μ_1, μ_2, …, μ_n coincide, the last formula is understood as the equality of the corresponding derivatives.

A discussion of the direct application of the Newton interpolating polynomial to the calculation of matrix functions can be found in [11, 16, 4].

3. The principal divided differences

Let us discuss the structure of the Newton interpolating polynomial in a special case. Let us assume that some k points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k} are situated close to each other (in particular, some of them may coincide with one another), and the rest of points μ_1, μ_2, …, μ_l and μ_{l+k+1}, μ_{l+k+2}, …, μ_n are situated far apart from them (it is possible that some of them are also close to each other). For better distinguishing, sometimes we denote the points from the second group by the symbols ν_1, ν_2, …, ν_l and ν_{l+k+1}, ν_{l+k+2}, …, ν_n instead of μ_1, μ_2, …, μ_l and μ_{l+k+1}, μ_{l+k+2}, …, μ_n.

We call a divided difference $\Delta_i^{i+m} g$ *principal* if its indices satisfy the inequalities $l+1 \le i$ and $i+m \le l+k$. In table (2) principal divided differences form a triangle

with the legs of the length k. For the sake of clarity we write out some principal divided differences, for example, when $k = 3$:

$$\begin{array}{lll} f(\mu_{l+1}), & f(\mu_{l+2}), & f(\mu_{l+3}), \\ \dfrac{f(\mu_{l+2}) - f(\mu_{l+1})}{\mu_{l+2} - \mu_{l+1}}, & \dfrac{f(\mu_{l+3}) - f(\mu_{l+2})}{\mu_{l+3} - \mu_{l+2}}, & \\ \dfrac{\frac{f(\mu_{l+3})-f(\mu_{l+2})}{\mu_{l+3}-\mu_{l+2}} - \frac{f(\mu_{l+2})-f(\mu_{l+1})}{\mu_{l+2}-\mu_{l+1}}}{\mu_{l+3} - \mu_{l+1}}. & & \end{array}$$

We call a divided difference $\Delta_i^{i+m} g$ *non-principal* if its indices satisfy the inequalities $l + 1 \le i \le l + k$ and $i + m > l + k$. In table (2) non-principle divided differences are situated below principle ones.

According to definition (1), divided differences must be computed row by row (in any order in each row). We note that principle divided differences may be computed separately (row by row), i.e., independently of other divided differences.

We stress that problems with division by a difference of close numbers arise when we compute principal divided differences, but does not arise when we compute non-principle ones. Actually, according to (1), when we compute the denominator of a principal divided difference $\Delta_{l+i}^{l+m} f$ the new difference $\mu_{l+m} - \mu_{l+i}$ (of close numbers μ_{l+m} and μ_i) arise. But when we compute non-principal divided differences, new denominators may have only the form $\nu_j - \mu_{l+i}$ (which are not small numbers).

We summarize these observations in the following proposition.

Proposition 3. *The divided differences of the function f possess the following properties.*

(a) *Principal divided differences depend only on the points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k} and the values of the function f (and may be its derivatives) at these points.*
(b) *The denominators of the form $\mu_{l+m} - \mu_{l+i}$ with $i, m = 1, \dots, k$ (which are small numbers) may appear only during the calculation of principal divided differences (after that they may get into non-principal divided differences, but only in an implicit form as parts of already calculated principle ones).*
(c) *The denominators of the form $\nu_j - \mu_{l+i}$ with $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j \ne l + 1, \dots, l + k$ (which are large numbers) may appear only in non-principal divided differences.*

Proof. The complete proof is by induction on m. □

Proposition 3(c) shows that if we meet with success in organizing the calculation of principal divided differences without essential losses of accuracy, then there will be no large losses of accuracy in the calculation of non-principal ones as well.

In order to compute the principal divided differences we approximate the function f in a neighbourhood of the points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k} by a polynomial h. The simplest and universal way is to take for h the Taylor polynomial of the function f about the middle point

$$\bar{\mu} = \frac{\mu_{l+1} + \mu_{l+2} + \dots + \mu_{l+k}}{k}.$$

It is desirable that some disk centered in $\bar{\mu}$ contains all the points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k} and lies in the domain of the function f. We note that it would be more convenient to take for $\bar{\mu}$ the centre of a disk of the smallest radius that contains

all the points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k}. But finding such a centre requires additional efforts.

In the absence of a complementary information on the matrix A it is reasonable to take the degree of h not less than $k-1$. In exact arithmetic, the higher degree of h, the better approximation may be achieved, but the enlargement of the degree of h slows down the calculations. Thus a compromise is necessary, for a detailed discussion see [3].

So, let us assume that in a neighbourhood of $\bar{\mu}$ the function f is replaced by the polynomial

$$h(\lambda) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k+\gamma} c_\alpha (\lambda - \bar{\mu})^\alpha \tag{4}$$

of degree $k+\gamma$, where $\gamma = -1, 0, 1, \ldots$. For the sake of clarity, we write out principal divided differences of h for the special case when $k = 4$ and $\gamma = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{l+1}^{l+1} h &= c_0 + c_1\xi_{l+1} + c_2\xi_{l+1}^2 + c_3\xi_{l+1}^3 + c_4\xi_{l+1}^4,\\
\Delta_{l+1}^{l+2} h &= c_1 + c_2(\xi_{l+1} + \xi_{l+2}) + c_3(\xi_{l+1}^2 + \xi_{l+1}\xi_{l+2} + \xi_{l+2}^2)\\
&\quad + c_4(\xi_{l+1}^3 + \xi_{l+1}^2\xi_{l+2} + \xi_{l+1}\xi_{l+2}^2 + \xi_{l+2}^3),\\
\Delta_{l+1}^{l+3} h &= c_2 + c_3(\xi_{l+1} + \xi_{l+2} + \xi_{l+3})\\
&\quad + c_4(\xi_{l+1}^2 + \xi_{l+2}^2 + \xi_{l+2}^2 + \xi_{l+3}^2 + \xi_{l+1}\xi_{l+2} + \xi_{l+1}\xi_{l+3} + \xi_{l+2}\xi_{l+3}),\\
\Delta_{l+1}^{l+4} h &= c_3 + c_4(\xi_{l+1} + \xi_{l+2} + \xi_{l+3} + \xi_{l+4}),
\end{aligned}$$

where ξ_i is the shorthand for $\mu_i - \bar{\mu}$.

The structure of h is described in the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *Let a function h be a polynomial of the form* (4) *in a neighbourhood of the points μ_i, μ_{i+1}, …, μ_{i+m}. Then the divided differences of the function h possess the representation*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_i^{i+m} h &= \sum_{\alpha=m}^{k+\gamma} c_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha-m}(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m})\\
&= c_m + \sum_{\alpha=m+1}^{k+\gamma} c_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha-m}(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m}),
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the homogeneous polynomials σ_α are defined by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_0(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m}) &= 1,\\
\sigma_\alpha(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m}) &= \sum_{i_0+i_1+\cdots+i_m=\alpha} \xi_i^{i_0}\xi_{i+1}^{i_1}\ldots\xi_{i+m}^{i_m}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, the divided differences of the function h does not contain differences of close numbers in denominators (in this representation).

Proof. Since we are interested only in principal divided differences, by Proposition 3(a), we may assume that $k = n$. We proceed by induction on m. For $m = 0$ the assertion is evident. We assume that representation (5) holds for $\Delta_i^{i+m-1} h = h^{[m-1]}(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m-1})$. We show that representation (5) holds for $\Delta_i^{i+m} h = h^{[m]}(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}, \ldots, \xi_{i+m-1}, \xi_{i+m})$. We begin with the auxiliary identity

(if $\xi_{i+m}=\xi_i$, the division by $\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i$ is understood as the differentiation; cf. the definition of a divided difference)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\sigma_\alpha(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_{i+m})-\sigma_\alpha(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_i)}{\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i}\\
&=\sum_{i_0+i_1+\dots+i_{m-1}=\alpha}\xi_{i+1}^{i_1}\dots\xi_{i+m-1}^{i_m}\frac{\xi_{i+m}^{i_0}-\xi_i^{i_0}}{\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i}\\
&=\sum_{i_0+i_1+\dots+i_{m-1}=\alpha}\xi_{i+1}^{i_1}\dots\xi_{i+m-1}^{i_m}\sum_{i_{i+m}=0}^{i_0-1}\xi_i^{i_0-i_{i+m}}\xi_{i+m}^{i_{i+m}}\\
&=\sum_{i_0+i_1+\dots+i_m=\alpha-1}\xi_i^{i_0}\xi_{i+1}^{i_1}\dots\xi_{i+m-1}^{i_m}\xi_{i+m}^{i_{i+m}}\\
&=\sigma_{\alpha-1}(\xi_i,\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m}).
\end{aligned}$$

By definition and by Corollary 2 we can represent $\Delta_i^{i+m}h$ in the form

$$\Delta_i^{i+m}h=\frac{h^{[m-1]}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_{i+m})-h^{[m-1]}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_i)}{\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i}.$$

Therefore (by the above auxiliary identity)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_i^{i+m}h&=\frac{h^{[m-1]}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_{i+m})-h^{[m-1]}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_i)}{\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i}\\
&=\frac{1}{\xi_{i+m}-\xi_i}\Bigg(\sum_{\alpha=m-1}^{k+l}c_\alpha\sigma_{\alpha-m+1}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_{i+m})\\
&\quad-\sum_{\alpha=m-1}^{k+l}c_\alpha\sigma_{\alpha-m+1}(\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m-1},\xi_i)\Bigg)\\
&=\sum_{\alpha=m}^{k+l}c_\alpha\sigma_{\alpha-m}(\xi_i,\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m})\\
&=c_m+\sum_{\alpha=m+1}^{k+l}c_\alpha\sigma_{\alpha-m}(\xi_i,\xi_{i+1},\dots,\xi_{i+m}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, representation (5) is established. □

Finally, we arrive at the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *Let in a neighbourhood of the points μ_{l+1}, μ_{l+2}, …, μ_{l+k} the function f coincide with a polynomial. Then the divided differences $\Delta_i^{i+m}f$, $l+1\le i\le l+k$, can be computed without subtraction of close numbers in denominators.*

Proof. For principal divided differences the proof follows from Proposition 4. For non-principal divided differences the proof follows from Proposition 3. □

4. An algorithm for the calculation of a matrix function

Let A be a square matrix of the size $n\times n$. In order to find its eigenvalues we apply to the matrix A the Schur algorithm, see [7]. (If the matrix A is real, the real form of the Schur algorithm can be used; it generates a block triangular matrix

with diagonal elements of the sizes 2×2 and 1×1.) We write out the eigenvalues of A (counted with multiplicity): $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n$.

Let a small number $\delta > 0$ be given. We split the set of all eigenvalues into clusters (parts) $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_\beta$ in such a way that [3]

(a) $|\mu_i - \mu_j| \geq \delta$ for any $\mu_i \in S_i$ and $\mu_j \in S_j$ with $i \neq j$;
(b) for any pair μ_1, μ_ω from the same cluster S_j there exists a chain $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k = \mu_\omega \in S_i$ such that $|\mu_i - \mu_{i+1}| < \delta$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$.

An algorithm for splitting eigenvalues into clusters can be found in [3, p. 474]. We denote by k_j the number of eigenvalues in the cluster S_j.

We reorder the eigenvalues. Namely, we arrange the eigenvalues in such a way that the eigenvalues from the same cluster are situated one after the other. Note that this reordering is essentially more simple than the reordering of diagonal elements in the Schur triangular representation.

Let f be an analytic function defined in a neighbourhood of the spectrum of the matrix A. Our aim is an approximate calculation of the matrix $f(A)$. We recall (see, e.g., [7, theorem 11.2.1]) that if at all points μ_i of the spectrum of A the values of functions f and p and their derivatives are close to each other up to the order of the multiplicity of μ_i, then $p(A) \approx f(A)$. So, for an approximation to $f(A)$ we take $p(A)$, where a polynomial p approximates f in a neighbourhood of the spectrum of A.

According to Section 3, on each cluster S_j we approximate the function f by a polynomial

$$h_j(\lambda) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k_j+\gamma_j} c_{\alpha j}(\lambda - \bar{\mu}_j)^\alpha, \tag{6}$$

where γ_j is chosen so that the difference $f - h_j$ is small in a neighbourhood of the cluster S_j. For each j, we compute principal divided differences of f as principal divided differences of h_j in accordance with formula (5). After principal divided differences are calculated for *all* j, we compute non-principal divided differences of f by definition (1). Next, we insert the divided differences into formula (3) and obtain the approximate Newton interpolating polynomial p. Finally, we substitute the matrix A into the polynomial p and obtain $p(A)$ which is approximately equals $f(A)$. We note that the employment of the Schur form may simplify this substitution.

We note that in exact arithmetic the offered algorithm results in the same approximation of $f(A)$ as the algorithm described in [3]. Indeed, it is easy to see that the calculation of $p(A)$, where p coincides with h_j in a neighbourhood of S_j, according to the algorithm from [14], gives just the result from [3]. Nevertheless the described algorithm needs not a reordering of eigenvalues in the Schur triangular representation and solving the Sylvester equations.

Let us discuss briefly how to choose δ. According to the definition, δ is the estimate of the distance between the clusters from below, i.e., δ is the best (known) constant in the estimate $\mu_i - \nu_j \geq \delta$, where μ_i and ν_j are from different clusters. Hence the calculation of $\mu_i - \nu_j$ may result in the drop of approximately $\log_{10}|\mu_i| - \log_{10}\delta$ significant decimal digits in floating point arithmetic. So, if the desirable final accuracy and the accuracy of the eigenvalues μ_i are known, one can estimate the smallest admissible δ.

A visual control may be very useful. Since we assume that the eigenvalues μ_i are known, we may display the spectrum of the matrix A. The figure can help to

choose clusters S_j and their centres $\bar\mu_j$ almost manually. If the eigenvalues have a kind of uniform distribution, the algorithm can be applied only in two extreme ways (it becomes trivial, but not obligatorily useless): either we interpret the whole spectrum as the only cluster (in this case the application of the algorithm implies the replacement of f by its Taylor polynomial) or we consider each eigenvalue as a separate cluster (in this case the application of the algorithm is equivalent to the calculation of $p(A)$, where p is the Newton interpolating polynomial (3) with divided differences calculated by direct formulas (1)).

5. Numerical experiments

In all numerical experiments we compute approximately e^A. The minimal possible distance $\delta = 0.01$ between clusters and the maximal possible size $\eta = 0.001$ of the clusters are the same for all experiments.

The results of the experiments are presented in Table 1 (numbers smaller than 10^{-10} are replaced with zeros). Each row of Table 1 describes the joint result of 1000 experiments with the same parameters. The headings of Table 1 have the following meanings: n is the order of the matrix A; K is the maximal admissible number k_j of eigenvalues in one cluster; γ is the parameter from formula (4) (it is assumed that γ is the same for all clusters S_j); $E(\varkappa(T))$ is the sample mean of the condition number $\varkappa(T) = \|T\| \cdot \|T^{-1}\|$ of the similarity transformation T defined below; $E\bigl(\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|}\bigr)$ is the sample mean of the relative accuracy $\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|}$, where e^A is the exact exponential of A and $p(A)$ is computed according to the algorithm from Section 4; $\mathrm{Max}(\varkappa(T))$ and $\mathrm{Max}\bigl(\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|}\bigr)$ are maximum values of the same quantities; M is the number of experiments (from 1000) that resulted in $\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|} > 0.001$. By $\|A\|$ we mean the operator norm

$$\|A\| = \max\{\, \|Ax\|_2 : \, \|x\|_2 = 1 \,\},$$

where $\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \dots + |x_n|^2}$.

Each numerical experiment consists in the following. First, the sequence k_1, k_2, …, k_β of multiplicities is constructed. The numbers k_j are defined as random whole numbers from $[1, K]$; the last number k_β is chosen so that $k_1 + \dots + k_\beta = n$. After that the approximate centres $\bar\mu_j^{(\mathrm{ini})}$, $j = 1, \dots, \beta$, are defined as random numbers from $[-2, 0] \times [-i\pi, i\pi]$. If $\min_{i\neq j} |\bar\mu_i^{(\mathrm{ini})} - \bar\mu_j^{(\mathrm{ini})}| < \delta$, then the sequence μ_1, μ_2, …, μ_β is rejected and another sequence is chosen. The eigenvalues μ_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$, of A from the jth cluster are defined as $\bar\mu_j^{(\mathrm{ini})}$ plus random numbers from $[-\eta, \eta] \times [-i\eta, i\eta]$ (we recall that the cluster S_j contains k_j eigenvalues). Let Λ be a diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements μ_i, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and T be a matrix (similarity transformation) consisting of random numbers from $[-1, 1] \times [-i, i]$. We set $A = T^{-1}\Lambda T$ (we never met a case when T is not invertible). We take for the exact matrix e^A the matrix $T^{-1}e^\Lambda T$. Finally we compute the approximation $p(A)$ of e^A according to the algorithm from Section 4 and compare $p(A)$ with the exact matrix e^A.

The first three rows of Table 1 corresponds to the case $K = 1$, which means that there are no close eigenvalues; in this case the method under discussion coincides with the ordinary usage of the Newton interpolating polynomial (thus, the value of γ makes no difference). The numerical experiments show that the direct usage

of the Newton interpolating polynomial (within the framework of this experiment, i.e., for $\delta = 0.01$, the function $f(\lambda) = e^{\lambda}$ etc.) is not reliable if $n > 60$. The next four rows show that in the case $n = 40$ the algorithm should be applied with care. The case where $K \le 30$ can be considered as more or less admissible. The case $K \le 20$ is quite reliable; in this case taking $\gamma > -1$ is not very essential.

TABLE 1. Results of numerical experiments

n	K	γ	$\mathrm{Max}(\varkappa(T))$	$\mathrm{E}(\varkappa(T))$	$\mathrm{Max}\big(\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|}\big)$	$\mathrm{E}\big(\frac{\|p(A)-e^A\|}{\|e^A\|}\big)$	M
70	1	-1	211500	4664	158.6	0.2101	82
60	1	-1	107400	3196	0.001646	5.03×10^{-6}	2
50	1	-1	166600	2375	5.839×10^{-6}	8.722×10^{-9}	0
40	2	-1	46850	1648	32.39	0.05746	56
40	2	5	70450	1749	0.001696	1.699×10^{-6}	1
40	4	-1	138000	1810	7.793×10^{7}	109000	146
40	4	5	63870	1817	7.759×10^{8}	789400	67
30	2	-1	86900	1062	356.5	0.3565	1
30	2	5	70990	1043	0	0	0
30	4	-1	34700	1015	16.85	0.01878	17
30	4	5	42530	1011	0.000098	1.037×10^{-7}	0
30	8	-1	49010	1099	861200	1144	36
30	8	5	57790	1163	1.88×10^{8}	190400	13
20	4	-1	97310	668	5.046×10^{-7}	2.032×10^{-9}	0
20	4	5	15090	582.3	0	0	0
20	8	-1	35840	589.2	3.045	0.003217	3
20	8	5	24080	551.5	6.936×10^{-6}	1.173×10^{-8}	0
20	16	-1	27380	588.3	1155.	1.155	2
20	16	5	21470	615.3	0.0009528	9.528×10^{-7}	0

6. Symbolic calculation of the impulse response

The offered algorithm can be applied to a calculation of analytic functions f_t of A depending on a parameter, e.g., $f_t(\lambda) = e^{\lambda t}$. In this Section we discuss an example of such a problem.

Let us consider the dynamical system

$$\begin{aligned} x'(t) &= Ax(t) + bu(t), \\ y(t) &= \langle x(t), d\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

with the scalar input u and the scalar output y. Here, $b, d \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are given vectors, and the symbol $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ means the inner product. In the majority of applications the spectrum of A is contained in the open left half plane. We also note that in many applications (e.g., in control problems) a high accuracy (more than 0.001) of the solution makes no sense, because the accuracy of the initial physical model is essentially lower.

The impulse response of system (7) is the solution y of (7) that corresponds to the input $u(t) = \delta(t)$, where δ is the Dirac function, and equals zero when $t < 0$.

It is well known that the impulse response of system (7) can be represented in the form

$$t \mapsto \langle d, e^{At} b \rangle, \qquad t > 0. \tag{8}$$

We assume that the order n of the matrix A is rather small (n is about 10). In this case the algorithm under discussion allows one to present the impulse response in a symbolic form, i.e., in the form of a formula. If the order n of A is large, the symbolic representation of the impulse response is too cumbersome; in this case, some reduced order method [1, 2] can be applied in advance.

We interpret the matrix e^{At} as the analytic function $f_t(\lambda) = e^{\lambda t}$ depending on the parameter t applied to the matrix A. Hence we are able to make use of the algorithm from Section 4. In a neighbourhood of the cluster S_j we define h_j as the Taylor polynomial of the function $f_t(\lambda) = e^{\lambda t}$ depending on the parameter t:

$$h_j(\lambda) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{k_j+\gamma_j} \frac{t^\alpha e^{\bar{\mu}_j t}}{\alpha!} (\lambda - \bar{\mu}_j)^\alpha.$$

This is a special case of formula (6) with the coefficients

$$c_{\alpha j}(t) = \frac{t^\alpha e^{\bar{\mu}_j t}}{\alpha!}, \qquad j = 1, \dots, \beta, \quad \alpha = 0, \dots k_j + \gamma_j,$$

depending on the parameter t. Therefore proposition 4 remains valid. As a result the divided differences Δ_i^{i+m}, the coefficients of the Newton interpolating polynomial p from Section 4, and the elements of the matrix $p(A)$ are linear combinations of the functions $c_{\alpha j}$. Thus finally we arrive at a formula similar to the classical representation of the impulse response in the form of a linear combination of the functions $t \mapsto \frac{t^\alpha e^{\mu_i t}}{\alpha!}$.

But there are some distinctions. We recall that the degree $k_j + \gamma_j$ of the polynomial h_j may happen to be greater than the number k_j of points in the cluster S_j diminished by 1 (provided that $\gamma_j > -1$). In this case the power α in the expression $t^\alpha e^{\bar{\mu}_j t}$ may turn out to be more than $k_j - 1$, which is unusual for the exact representation of the impulse response. Besides, the numbers $\bar{\mu}_j$ may not coincide precisely with the eigenvalues μ_i of A.

Numerical experiments show that the substitution $t = 1$ into the matrix-function $t \mapsto e^{At}$ computed in the described way gives the result which coincides within the accuracy of calculations (10^{-16}) with e^A computed in accordance with the algorithm from Section 4.

We conclude with the well known remark. Representation (8) of the impulse response shows that when we substitute the powers A^i of the matrix A into the polynomial p it is enough to restrict ourselves to the calculation of $A^i b$ instead of the whole A^i.

7. Conclusion

An algorithm for computing an analytic function of an $n \times n$-matrix A is presented. This algorithm is a modification of the algorithms from [14, 15, 16, 10, 11, 3, 9]. The algorithm works correctly when A is allowed to have close eigenvalues. It reliably works when $n \leq 20$. The algorithm can be used for the calculation of a symbolic representation of the impulse response of a dynamical system of small dimension.

References

[1] A.C. Antoulas, *Approximation of Large-Scale Dynamical Systems.* Philadelphia: SIAM, 2005.

[2] P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, D. C. Sorensen, *Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems.* Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering, Vol. 45. Berlin–Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2005.

[3] Ph.I. Davies, N.J. Higham, A Schur–Parlett algorithm for computing matrix functions. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, **25**(2), 2003, 464–485.

[4] M. Dehghan, M. Hajarian, Determination of a matrix function using the divided difference method of Newton and the interpolation technique of Hermite. *J. Computational and Applied Mathematics*, **231**, 2009, 67–81.

[5] F.R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices,* 4th edn. Moscow: Nauka, 1988. (in Russian; English transl. of the 1st edn. New York: Chelsea, 1959.)

[6] A.O. Gel'fond, *Calculus of Finite Differences,* 2nd edn. Moscow: GIPhML, 1959. (in Russian; English transl. India: Hindustan, 1971.)

[7] G.H. Golub, C.F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computation*, 3rd edn. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

[8] N.J. Higham, P.A. Knight, Matrix powers in finite precision arithmetic. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, **16**(2), 1995, 343–358.

[9] N.J. Higham, A.H. Al-Mohy, Computing matrix functions. *Acta Numerica*, **19**, 2010, 159–208.

[10] B. Kågström, Numerical computation of matrix functions. *Report UMINF–58.77.* Sweden: Department of Information Processing, University of Umeå, 1977.

[11] A. McCurdy, K.C. Ng, B.N. Parlett, Accurate computation of divided differences of the exponential function. *Mathematics of Computation*, **43**(168), 1984, 501–528.

[12] C. Moler, C.F. Van Loan, Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix. *SIAM Review*, **20**(4), 1978, 801–836.

[13] C. Moler, C.F. Van Loan, Nineteen dubious ways to compute the exponential of a matrix, twenty-five years later. *SIAM Review*, **45**(1), 2003, 3–49.

[14] B.N. Parlett, Computation of functions of triangular matrices. *Memorandum ERL-M481.* Berkeley: Electronics Research Laboratory, College of Engineering, University of California, 1974.

[15] B.N. Parlett, A recurrence among the elements of functions of triangular matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, **14**, 1976, 117–121.

[16] B.N. Parlett, K.C. Ng, Development of an accurate algorithm for exp (Bt). *Technical report PAM–294.* Berkeley: Center for Pure and Applied Mathematics, University of California, 1985.

[17] C.F. Van Loan, A note on the evaluation of matrix polynomials. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, **AC–24**(2), 1979, 320–321.

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration
E-mail address: kv51@inbox.ru

Air Force Academy of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation
E-mail address: la_soleil@bk.ru